

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-22 were pending in the present application. The applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the present application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Rosen, et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,430,393, (hereinafter "Rosen") in view of Berman, et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,091,934, (hereinafter "Berman"). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

With regard to independent claim 1, the Examiner has indicated that that Rosen teaches elements of the claimed invention. Applicants respectfully submit that while Rosen may describe a lookup table, Rosen fails to teach the claimed packet switch routing self addressed uplink data to a memory, with the memory comprising at least a first and a second downlink beam hop location storage. In Rosen, downlink beam steering is data driven based on cell identifiers in user data addresses. Rosen notably fails to specifically teach that user data packets are stored in anywhere but a queue corresponding to the cell specified in the cell identifier since data is bursted when the beam is steered to the cell (col 6, line 61).

The Examiner further admits that Rosen fails to teach or suggest the claimed power amplifier and power gating circuit. To account for the deficiency, Berman is included in the applied art combination as allegedly teaching the claimed power amplifier and gating circuit. Applicants respectfully disagree with the characterization that Berman teaches the claimed power gating circuit, e.g. a power gating circuit coupled to the power amplifier and including a power gate input responsive to a power gating signal *to remove RF power* from at least a portion of the waveform, thereby reducing DC power consumption of the power amplifier.

A close review of Berman reveals that, at best, a command voltage can be applied to a power supply (28) to substitute a commanded voltage level for a sensed voltage level through a

switch (32) *to amplify the downlink signals* (col 4, line 28). Applicants respectfully submit that the above noted description does not amount to a teaching of a power gating circuit responsive to a power gating signal to remove RF power from at least a portion of the waveform and, further, can be considered to amount to a contrary teaching.

With regard to independent claim 10, Applicants respectfully submit that for many of the same reasons set forth above, Berman and thus the applied art combination fail to teach or suggest that, prior to transmission, at least a portion of the frame signal is power gated in response to a power gating signal. Berman, at best, may teach the ability to override sensed signal levels to amplify a downlink signal during transmission, but this does not amount to a teaching of the claimed feature of prior to transmission, power gating at least a portion of the frame signal in response to a power gating signal. Applicants submit that the examiner has not clearly identified what in Berman allegedly amounts to the claimed power gating signal. As noted, while Berman, at best, describes that the command signal controls when a signal should be amplified (col 4, line 28), no power gating signal is taught.

With regard to independent claim 18, Applicants respectfully submit that for many of the same reasons set forth above, Berman, and thus the applied art combination, fails to teach or suggest a waveform generator coupled to the packet switch, the waveform generator comprising a modulator for producing a waveform to be transmitted and a power gating input for carrying a power gating signal for removing power from at least a portion of the waveform before transmission. As noted above, the command signal of Berman, at best, controls when a signal should be amplified (col 4, line 28), however no power gating signal or waveform generator is taught.

Accordingly a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established in that the applied art combination fails to teach or suggest all the claimed features as required. It is

respectfully requested therefore that the rejection of independent claims 1, 10, and 18 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 1-9, 11-17, and 19-22 by virtue of depending from claims 1, 10, and 18 are believed allowable for at least the reasons set forth hereinabove with regard to claims 1, 10, and 18. It is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 1-9, 11-17, and 19-22 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

In view of the forgoing, Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance. A timely notice to that effect is respectfully requested. If questions relating to patentability remain, the examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone.

Please charge any unforeseen fees that may be due to Deposit Account No. 50-1147.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'D. G. Posz', is written over a horizontal line.

David G. Posz  
Reg. No. 37, 701

Posz & Bethards, PLC  
11250 Roger Bacon Drive, Suite 10  
Reston, VA 20190  
Phone 703-707-9110  
Fax 703-707-9112  
Customer No. 23400